

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-11, and 14-18 are pending. Claims 1, 8 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 2-6, 9-11, and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 8, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Rodriguez , US 2,200,935. (first applied in paper no. 11.) Rodriguez discloses plates (truck bases) that can be attached to a foot board with bolts or screws and a stringer of wood or other desired material positioned between the bottom surface of the foot board and the plates. (See Fig. 1 and page 1, column 2, lines 2-10.)

Claims 1, 8, and 14 have been amended to reflect limitations not taught by the Rodriguez '935 patent. The amended claims include limitations that reflect the structure of the bottom surface of the slide plate as disclosed in the specification.

In Claim 1, line 4, a "lower surface" is added to the slide plate. In lines 6-8 of claim 1, the lower surface is said to have resilient properties and a consistent, uninterrupted surface. Claim 14 has been amended in a similar manner. Claim 14, lines 7-10, adds a bottom surface having resilient properties and a consistent, continuous surface. The slide plate disclosed in the specification provides for a resilient, consistent, unobtrusive surface (page 3 and line 4-5 of page 4) that maintains a consistent and unobtrusive surface for sliding unlike the bottom surface of a skateboard deck that becomes damaged providing an inconsistent, obtrusive sliding surface that is undesirable (bottom of page 1, top and bottom of page 2). Rodriguez '935 teaches a stringer that can be made of wood or other desired

material; thus Rodriguez does not teach a slide plate with a lower surface having resilient properties and a consistent, unobtrusive or uninterrupted surface (Rodriguez, page 1, column 2, lines 2-10). The material (wood) taught for use as a stringer by Rodriguez would have structural qualities more like a conventional modern skateboard with a bottom surface that is inconsistent and lacking resilient properties, making it more prone to damage

Claim 8 also adds additional structural limitations for the lower surface of the slide plate. Claim 8, lines 5-8, is amended to provide for a hard, consistent surface. Rodriguez '935 teaches a stringer made of wood or other desired material (page 1, column 2, lines 2-10). Thus, Rodriguez does not teach a slide plate with a lower surface having a hard, consistent sliding surface. These structural limitations provide a slide plate with structural qualities that allow it to maintain a consistent, unobtrusive surface for sliding. Rodriguez teaches wood or other desirable materials suitable for a stringer and does not teach these structural limitations which provide a maintainable consistent, unobtrusive sliding surface. The wood stringer of Rodriguez does not have a bottom surface that possesses the structural qualities for maintaining a proper sliding surface through continued use as taught by the specification for the current invention.

Applicant respectfully seeks reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 10, and 16 stand rejected based on the proposition that resilient plastics are well known in the manufacturing arts and it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the stringer of Rodriguez (US 2,200,935)

from resilient plastic to provide a stringer that is lightweight and has high impact strength, thus improving the life-span of the chassis.

Claims 3, 11, 17, and 18 stand rejected based on the proposition that it is well known to adjust the thickness of the structural members of designed mechanism to meet a specific requirement, such as height. As such, it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the thickness of the stringer of Rodriguez (US 2,200,935) for purposes of achieving a particular height of the platform above the ground surface.

Claims 6, 9, and 16 stand rejected based on the proposition that it is well known to decrease the size of manufactured elements for purposes of using lesser quantities of material. As such, it would be obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to decrease the length of the manufactured elements (stringer of Rodriguez '147) for the purpose of using lesser quantities of material.

The applicant argues that the claims listed above are not obvious on the grounds that the limitations of amended claims 1, 8, and 14 from which they depend are patentably distinguishable from the teachings of Rodriguez (US 2,200,935).

Applicant respectfully seeks reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-6, claims 9-11, and claims 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103

It is respectfully submitted that Applicant has addressed each of the Examiner's rejections. If this reply is found to be incomplete, or a telephone conference can help advance this application, please telephone the undersigned at 202-363-1844.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date 6-10-03

William C. Ronnenberg Jr. # 48,693

William C. Ronnenberg Jr., Reg. No. 48,693

2950 Van Ness Street NW #603

Washington, DC 20008

(202) 363-1844